	N7DDJAVC	
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
2	X	
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	
4	v.	23 Cr. 251 (AKH)
5	CHARLIE JAVICE AND OLIVIER AMAR,	
6 7	Defendants.	Conference
8	x	
9		New York, N.Y. July 13, 2023
10		10:45 a.m.
11	Before:	
12	HON. ALVIN K. HELLEF	RSTEIN,
13		U.S. District Judge
14	APPEARANCES	o.s. District daage
15		
16	DAMIAN WILLIAMS United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York	
17	DINA MCLEOD MICAH FESTA FERGENSON	
18	Assistant United States Attorney	
19	ALEXANDER B. SPIRO Attorneys for Defendant Charlie J.	avi co
20	_	dvice
21	SEAN BUCKLEY STEVE KOBRE	
22	Attorneys for Defendant Olivier A	mar
23		
24		
25		

(Case called) 1 2 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Counsel, please state your 3 appearances for the record, and remain seated 4 THE COURT: Remove your mask when you speak. MR. FERGENSON: Good morning, your Honor. Micah 5 Fergenson and Dina McLeod for the government. 6 7 THE COURT: Good morning. MR. SPIRO: Good morning, your Honor. Alex Spiro. 8 9 I'm joined by my colleagues Maaren Shah and Sam Nitze on behalf of Ms. Javice. 10 THE COURT: Good morning. 11 12 MR. BUCKLEY: Good morning, your Honor. Sean Buckley 13 and Steve Kobre on behalf of Mr. Amar, who joins us at counsel 14 table. 15 THE COURT: Good morning. 16 Who is Mr. Kobre? How do you do. 17 Is Tai Hyun Park and Jan Philip Kernisan here? Are 18 they on this case? 19 MR. SPIRO: They are not, your Honor. 20 THE COURT: Okay. So what are we doing now, 21 Ms. McLeod? 22 MR. FERGENSON: Yes, your Honor. So I think the first 23 order of business is to arraign both defendants on the 24 superseding indictment; and then on scheduling, your Honor, the 25 plan at the first conference had been to set a motion schedule

1	today. Given the addition of the new defendant, we understand	
2	that the defense is going to ask for, you know, some additional	
3	time to come back and set a motion schedule in 45 or 60 days,	
4	your Honor.	
5	And, lastly, I just note that at the Court's	
6	convenience, as we noted at the first conference, the	
7	government is ready to set a trial date.	
8	THE COURT: Fine. Let's arraign the two defendants.	
9	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Where is Charlie Javice? I'm	
10	sorry. I should have remembered.	
11	You are Charlie Javice?	
12	DEFENDANT JAVICE: I am.	
13	THE COURT: Please stand. Remove your mask.	
14	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Have you seen a copy of the	
15	indictment?	
16	DEFENDANT JAVICE: I have.	
17	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Have you discussed it with your	
18	attorney?	
19	DEFENDANT JAVICE: I have.	
20	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Would you like me to read it to	
21	you?	
22	DEFENDANT JAVICE: No, thank you.	
23	THE DEPUTY CLERK: How do you plead?	
24	DEFENDANT JAVICE: Not guilty.	
25	THE COURT: A plea of not guilty will be entered on	

1	behalf of Ms. Javice.
2	How do you pronounce Javice?
3	DEFENDANT JAVICE: Javice, your Honor.
4	THE COURT: Javice. Thank you.
5	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Mr. Amar. You are Olivier Amar?
6	DEFENDANT AMAR: Correct.
7	THE COURT: Have you seen a copy of the indictment?
8	DEFENDANT AMAR: I have.
9	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Have you discussed it with your
10	attorney?
11	DEFENDANT AMAR: I have.
12	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Would you like me to read it to
13	you?
14	DEFENDANT AMAR: No, thank you.
15	THE DEPUTY CLERK: How do you plead?
16	DEFENDANT AMAR: Not guilty.
17	THE COURT: A plea of not guilty will be entered on
18	behalf of Mr. Amar.
19	So, again, both defendants plead not guilty.
20	Mr. Fergenson, please tell me more about the case.
21	There's not much in the indictment.
22	MR. FERGENSON: Yes, your Honor.
23	So the case relates to the acquisition of a company
24	called Frank. Frank was a start up fintech company that sought
25	to help students apply for financial aid for college or

graduate school. Ms. Javice was the CEO and founder of Frank.

Mr. Amar was the chief growth officer, effectively the number

two at the company.

In 2021, the defendants sought to put their company on the market for an acquisition. They pitched to a variety of potential acquiring companies, including two major banks. The bank that ultimately acquired Frank was JPMorgan Chase. A material part of that deal, your Honor, was the number of customers or the number of account sign-ups that Frank had.

The defendants lead Chase and others to believe that Frank had over four million customer sign-ups. In reality, the number was far less, around 300,000. Eventually, and, you know, your Honor, there's a very detailed complaint that has additional facts, but at a high level, eventually, JPMC found out about the fraud, terminated the defendants. And that's why we're here today.

THE COURT: But there was no acquisition?

MR. FERGENSON: There actually was an acquisition, your Honor. I apologize if I skimmed over that. Chase acquired Frank for \$175 million.

THE COURT: Was Frank an audited company?

MR. FERGENSON: It was not, your Honor. I mean, it was not a publicly traded company. It was a start up.

THE COURT: Did it have Certified Public Accountants doing audits?

MR. FERGENSON: I'm not certain of that, your Honor, but it may well have.

THE COURT: It's curious to me how this kind of set of facts could continue through an acquisition --

MR. FERGENSON: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: -- understanding the due diligence Chase and Chase's lawyers, and Chase's investment bankers, and the accounting that was done at Frank.

MR. FERGENSON: Yes. And perhaps to provide a little more context on that, your Honor, in the course of the due diligence on the deal, JPMorgan sent the defendants a data validation request. So they said, you've told us you have all this data from your account sign-ups, these, you know, over four million people. We want to verify that, that you actually have this data.

And in response, the defendants created a fake data set. So a giant -- essentially, a giant Excel spreadsheet that had over four million rows, and lots of purported data. But it was all fake. And they sent that to a -- you know, a data company, essentially, that was going to perform the diligence to check that they had, in fact, had data in the rows and columns, as they had represented. And that's what they did, because it, in fact, was filled in as was represented, even though it was all fake. The data validation company, this third party, said, yeah, they have data filled in these rows.

And then, I think the second point, your Honor, is that the defendants immediately sought to start the cover up as well. So they actually went — they knew that eventually Chase, since they had been acquired and become a part of it, would ask them for the customer data list, and they wouldn't be able to send them a completely fake list, so they went and purchased, on the open market, college student data. And they bought a list of over four million college students, and when Chase eventually went and asked them, okay, send your student data list, they sent this student list that they had bought on the open market.

And the way Chase I think ultimately identified the fraud, and what lead them to start sort of investigating the issue, there were a few things, but one of the important events was they sent this list that they had bought on the open market — and they bought it for \$100,000, your Honor. A lot less than 175 million. And when Chase — they sent that to Chase. When Chase did a test run of a marketing campaign, so they sent an email, marketing email to about 400,000 of the students on this list. The response was horrible. A lot of the emails were old and didn't work. Almost nobody clicked through to it. And it was completely unexpected.

I mean, it basically essentially, from their view, was if not worthless, worth a lot less than what they had expected.

THE COURT: This was discovered after the acquisition?

1	MR. FERGENSON: That's correct, your Honor. It took
2	several months, and then there was an investigation.
3	THE COURT: There was a fraud, and they uncovered the
4	fraud.
5	MR. FERGENSON: Correct, your Honor.
6	THE COURT: All right. So what are we going to do
7	now? You want a delay of how much time?
8	MR. FERGENSON: I'll defer to the defense. We
9	understand that they were
10	THE COURT: Have you made your discovery?
11	MR. FERGENSON: Yes, your Honor. So we have produced
12	the Rule 16 in our possession today. We made a large initial
13	production at the time of the first the initial conference,
14	your Honor, and we made a second substantial production
15	recently. And those have been to Ms. Javice's counsel.
16	Mr. Amar's counsel has not given he just got
17	indicted yesterday, he does not yet have that discovery, but I
18	think certainly within the next two weeks, we will get him a
19	copy of all the Rule 16 in our possession, your Honor.
20	MR. SPIRO: Your Honor, this is Alex Spiro. May I
21	respond briefly?
22	THE COURT: You may.
23	MR. SPIRO: Your Honor asked a question in the

government's recitation, that some of it was a bit puzzling, or

raising a question with your Honor, and it sort of goes to

that, and a little bit of what the government is representing, and representing about discovery.

The reality is the government is just regurgitating to the Court JPMorgan's civil lawsuit against my client. That's actually all it was. They haven't received --

THE COURT: Mr. Spiro, you don't have to worry about your client -- the government has the obligation to prove its case. I'm asking what they intend to prove.

MR. SPIRO: I understand, but I'm going to get to the discovery issue. We don't have currently, in discussion, we don't have any of JPMorgan's — essentially, any of their internal communications amongst themselves about the accusation. They sent us some discovery, told us it should be substantially completed within 45 days. They told the Court what they said in recitation, which I have an obligation I think in a public forum to respond to. They don't actually have, according to them, the internal communications of the JPMorgan side of this yet. They haven't provided them to us. And we believe that they will be exculpatory.

So I want the Court to understand that, and understand that's where we are in discovery. The way the discovery happened, and since we are --

THE COURT: Let me interrupt --

MR. SPIRO: Sure.

THE COURT: -- and ask Mr. Fergenson about that.

Are you intending to produce that information?

MR. FERGENSON: Yes, your Honor.

So we have produced, I think, from JPMC, well over 100,000 documents just from that one party. We understand they're continuing to make rolling productions. As we receive them, we will also produce them as Rule 16 discovery, your Honor.

I think Mr. Spiro may be slightly confused about the way Rule 16 works, which is the government provides the Rule 16 materials in its possession. We can't produce things we have not received.

MR. SPIRO: Your Honor, may I be heard further on the discovery issue?

THE COURT: You may.

MR. SPIRO: I'm not confused about Rule 16. This case has proceeded differently than other cases, because rather than a grand jury subpoena, the production of documents, an assessment — an independent assessment by the government, and then a decision to charge, JPMorgan simply provided what they wanted to provide to the government.

And so my point to the Court is this is a different set of discovery issues than what we thought existed at the time.

THE COURT: I understand what you want.

Let me ask this: Can you, under the Rules, issue a

	N7DDJAVC
1	trial subpoena to JPMorgan to produce, well, the things you say
2	you want to have?
3	MR. SPIRO: We can prepare one immediately for your
4	Honor, yes.
5	THE COURT: Would there be any objection to doing
6	that, Mr. Fergenson?
7	MR. FERGENSON: Your Honor, I think we would have to
8	assess whether it would comply with the requirements of Rule
9	17, but I think maybe just one further
10	THE COURT: It would be ahead of the trial, but for
11	purposes of use in a trial. I can see the relevance of that
12	information. Did JPMorgan rely on this information, from your
13	point from your account, reliance is suggested, but there
14	may be items in the correspondence that show differently.
15	I think it would be a good idea, but unless you
16	issue the subpoena
17	MR. FERGENSON: Well, your Honor, so when I mentioned
18	the rolling productions we're expecting to receive, we expect
19	those to also include additional internal JPMC communications.
20	THE COURT: Do they have a compulsion to deliver is
21	there a grand jury subpoena

MR. FERGENSON: Yes. Yes, your Honor.

23

24

25

THE COURT: So in complying with a subpoena.

MR. FERGENSON: Correct.

THE COURT: All right. It doesn't seem to me a

third-party subpoena is necessary, Mr. Spiro, but this is information obtained by the government to the extent it exists in the files of Chase Manhattan, Morgan Chase, and produced to you.

When do you think all your production will be finished, Mr. Fergenson?

MR. FERGENSON: Do you mean when we expect to produce the discovery we currently have?

THE COURT: You have to give a terminal date to Chase to get everything going. You can't let them just, at their leisure --

MR. FERGENSON: Understood, your Honor.

Look, our understanding is they're diligently responding to the subpoena that produced hundreds of thousands of documents, and there are hundreds of thousands of documents to review in total in this.

It's a bit of an unusual situation where JPMorgan acquired this company entirely, and so the documents responsive to, you know, the topic of its acquisition are voluminous. But our understanding is they are diligently responding. They've made several productions, including many substantial productions.

I just wanted to also note --

THE COURT: I think you should obtain a date from them, and let Mr. Spiro, and Mr. Amar's counsel, and me know

that.

that.

4 5

MR. FERGENSON: Understood, your Honor. We'll do

THE COURT: How much time do you need now, Mr. Spiro?

MR. SPIRO: I don't want to revisit the Groundhog Day

of last time, but I just need the discovery, and then we can —

so it's sort of circular to me that your Honor had, the last

time we were here, asked other pointed questions to the

government about the time. Your Honor just did it again.

THE COURT: How about I say to you 30 days from now.

MR. SPIRO: If 30 days from now is going to move this ball further down the field, so we can get the relevant discovery, not what we've been provided, absolutely happy to come back in 30 days.

THE COURT: I don't know that you'll be entitled to all of the discovery you would be in a civil case, but I'd like the government to discharge its obligations under Rule 16 promptly, not at a leisurely pace.

So we'll have a status conference in 30 days to find out where you stand.

MR. SPIRO: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: At that time, I will fix dates for motions.

MR. FERGENSON: Understood, your Honor. And I know Mr. Amar's counsel recently joined the case, but as long as

1	they are okay with 30 days to set the motion schedule as well,
2	that is fine for the government.
3	THE COURT: Nothing's going to happen in 30 days
4	except I'm going to know if there's more production or not.
5	MR. FERGENSON: Understood, your Honor.
6	THE COURT: And hopefully there will be some more
7	production.
8	MR. FERGENSON: Understood.
9	THE COURT: Is 30 days okay, Mr. Kobre? Mr. Buckley?
10	MR. BUCKLEY: Yes, your Honor. For a status
11	conference?
12	THE COURT: Yes.
13	MR. BUCKLEY: That's fine. Thank you.
14	THE COURT: Is there a <i>Brady</i> order in the case?
15	MS. MCLEOD: Actually, there is one for Javice, but
16	there is not one for
17	THE COURT: Take your mask off.
18	MS. MCLEOD: Sorry, your Honor.
19	There is one for Ms. Javice, but not for Mr. Amar. So
20	it makes sense to
21	THE COURT: The government knows its obligations under
22	Brady, what could happen in terms of trying the case if you
23	don't comply with <i>Brady</i> .
24	MR. FERGENSON: Yes, your Honor.
25	THE COURT: Okay. We'll put in such an order.

1	MR. FERGENSON: Thank you, your Honor.
2	THE COURT: Is there anything else you want to bring
3	to my attention, Mr. Spiro?
4	MR. SPIRO: No, your Honor. Thank you.
5	THE COURT: Mr. Buckley?
6	MR. BUCKLEY: No, your Honor. Thank you.
7	THE COURT: Okay. So I'll fix a date 30 days from
8	now.
9	THE DEPUTY CLERK: August 15 at 11:00.
10	THE COURT: August 15 at 11:00.
11	Any motion?
12	MR. FERGENSON: Yes, your Honor. The government moves
13	to exclude time under the Speedy Trial Act in the interests of
14	justice, so that the government can produce Rule 16 discovery
15	to Mr. Amar's counsel, and they can continue to and both
16	defendants can continue to assess any motions.
17	THE COURT: Without objection, folks?
18	MR. SPIRO: No, your Honor.
19	MR. BUCKLEY: No objection, your Honor.
20	THE COURT: So ordered.
21	Is there anything else you want to bring to my
22	attention?
23	MR. FERGENSON: No. Thank you, your Honor.
24	THE COURT: We'll see you in 30 days.
25	(Adjourned)